REMARKS

This Amendment is being submitted along with a Request for Continued Examination (RCE).

New claims 27 to 32 have been added. Support for these new claims can be found throughout Claims 13 and 15 to 26 are pending in the present application. Applicants request reconsideration of the present application in view of this response.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) – Ebert Reference, Crim Reference

In an earlier Office Action, claims 13, 15 to 18, 20 to 24, and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable by U.S. Patent No. 6,278,991 to Ebert in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,920,866 to Crim ("Crim reference").

Applicants respectfully submit that the Ebert reference taken in combination with the Crim reference does not teach or suggest each and every feature of claims 13, 15 to 18, 20 to 24, and 26.

The Ebert reference, at col. 2 as cited by the Office Action, recites merely that it is "an object of this invention to convey data in an efficient manner by displaying the data according to the data's hierarchical structure." Further, the Ebert reference, at Fig. 6a and its accompanying text at col. 7, lines 48-55, also cited by the Office Action, recites the situation in which a user selects object 522 (category "Financial Situation"), the result is a screen 610 showing lens 618, which is displaying a graphical representation of the category "Financial Situation." The Ebert reference further recites that the lens 618 displaying a graphical representation of object 620 that is a category one hierarchy level lower than "Financial Situation," and graphical representations of objects 630, 632, and 634, which are not categories. These two passages do not expressly disclose the requirements of method claim 13, including *the value tree of the data structure being mapped onto the at least one user-interface component; providing that the at least one graphical user interface component is in a recognizable relation to at least one node of the value tree; providing at least one of a graphical representation and a textual representation of the value is selectable for each subtree of the value tree;* and *for a processing of the value tree, deriving for each node a value list of all of values compatible with respect to assignment with the data types, and selecting one of the value from the value list for each value assignment,* in the manner claimed. **Instead, the Ebert reference appears to concern a label on each lens which provides information on the data originally displayed in the lens – and a user may choose to view the originally displayed contents of any lens on the screen.**

The Crim reference does not cure the deficiencies of the Ebert reference. The Crim reference appears to concern a process and apparatus for generating and editing value lists. The Crim reference refers to a user creating a value list having values selected from other fields, the created value list being given an identifying name so that it may be shared by other fields in a current database or another database.

Further, as Applicants mentioned in earlier submissions, even if one of ordinary skill in the art combined the two references, one would not necessarily obtain the invention of claim 13 in the present application. *That is, while the Ebert reference appears to concern itself with lenses in hierarchical situations, and the Crim reference appears to concern itself with generating and editing value lists, it does not necessarily follow that one of ordinary skill in the art would consider deriving for each node a value list of all values compatible with respect to assignment with the data types, and selecting one of the values from the values list for each value assignment, as in claim 13.* For motivation, the prior art references must suggest the desirability of such a combination, and the prior art references need to concern a similar "nature of the problem." In re Mills, 16 USPQ2d 1430 (Fed. Cir. 1990). Applicants respectfully submit, as discussed in detail above, that the Ebert and Crim references concern different issues and do not suggest – either expressly or implicitly – the desirability of such a combination.

In addition, it would be also improper to later suggest that the claimed features of a visualization of the window is first undertaken at a time on initialization *and* implementing specific rules when creating a value list are inherent in the claimed references, as well as suggesting that the same references are properly combinable. To suggest such inherency, there will need to be provided a "basis in fact and/or technical reasoning to reasonably support the determination that the allegedly inherent characteristics *necessarily* flows from the teachings of the applied art." (See M.P.E.P. § 2112; emphasis in original; and see *Ex parte Levy*, 17 U.S.P.Q.2d 1461, 1464 (Bd. Pat. App. & Int'f. 1990)). Thus, the M.P.E.P. and the case law make clear that simply because a certain result or characteristic may occur in the prior art does not establish the inherency of that result or characteristic.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Ebert and Crim references do not render obvious claim 13 or its dependent claims 15 to 18, 20 to 24, and 26. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 13, 15 to 18, 20 to 24, and 26, are allowable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the Ebert reference in view of the Crim reference.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) – Ebert Reference, Crim Reference, Gardner Reference

In an earlier Office Action, claims 19 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as anticipated by the Ebert reference in view of the Crim reference and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,701,352 to Gardner ("Gardner reference").

Claims 19 and 25 depend from claim 13. As discussed above, claim 13 is believed allowable over the Ebert and Crim references (taken alone or in combination).

The Gardner reference does not appear to cure the deficiencies of the Ebert and Crim references. The Gardner reference appears to concern automatically importing, according to predefined selection criteria, information stored at a resource remotely located across a network. The Gardner reference, even when taken in combination with the Ebert reference, does not teach or suggest at least the feature of for a processing of the value tree, deriving for each node a value list of all of values compatible with respect to assignment with the data types, and selecting one of the value from the value list for each value assignment as in claim 13, and thus, as in dependent claims 19 and 25. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 19 and 25 are allowable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the Ebert reference in view of the Crim reference and further in view of the Gardner reference.

New claims 27 to 32 contain features analogous to at least claim 13 and are allowable as well over the cited references.

In summary, it is respectfully submitted that all of claims 13, and 15 to 32 of the above-identified application are allowable for at least the foregoing reasons.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all claims 13 and 15 to 32, as presented above, are allowable. It is therefore respectfully requested that the present application issue as early as possible.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: _October 5, 2007_   By: _Linda Shudy Lecomte_

CUSTOMER NO. 26646

Linda Shudy Lecomte (Reg. No. 47,084)
KENYON & KENYON LLP
One Broadway
New York, New York 10004
(212) 425-7200